

REMARKS

Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment

In the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed March 26, 2008, the Office indicates that claim 1 has been amended but is improperly designated. Furthermore, the Office notes that there is no record of previous entry of the amendment for said claim. However, the amendments were submitted in an Amendment After Final dated August 16, 2007. Because the finality of the Office Action was withdrawn, these amendments should have been entered and considered by the Examiner in accordance with MPEP 706.07(e) which recites:

“When a final rejection is withdrawn, all amendments filed after the final rejection are ordinarily entered.”

A response to the Office Action of September 18, 2007 was submitted on December 18, 2007 under the assumption that the amendments previously filed on August 16, 2007 had been entered. Since it is now apparent that the August 16, 2007 amendments were not entered, Applicants provide herein substitute claim amendments and remarks responsive to the Office Action of September 18, 2007 based on the status of the claims prior to the August 16, 2007 amendments. Applicants request that the Examiner now consider the amendments and remarks presented herein.

Response to Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-14, 16-17, 19-25, 27-31, 33-38, 40-41, 43-51, and 53-55 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0059425 A1 to Belfiore, et al. (“Belfiore”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,555,346 to Gross, et al. The rejection is now respectfully traversed.

Representative claim 1, as amended, recites:

determining an occurrence of a condition indicating at least one transfer of an email message by an email application, wherein determining the occurrence of the condition is external to the email application;

identifying event data associated with the email message;

compiling an email event from at least some of the event data;

associating the email event with a conversation based at least in part on the event data, **the conversation comprising a thread of related email messages**; and

storing the email event, the association with the conversation, and the email message.

The method is advantageous because, for example, it stores a convenient organization of past email correspondences so that related messages can be easily accessed.

The claimed invention would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention considering the references either alone or in combination because neither reference discloses or suggests associating an email event with a conversation comprising a thread of related email messages, as recited in the claims. Belfiore discloses a distributed computing services platform that uses an eXtensible Markup Language (XML) to facilitate communication between servers and/or client devices. As indicated by the Examiner, Belfiore fails to expressly disclose several features of the claimed invention including, "...associating the email event with a conversation based at least in part on the event data; and storing the email event, the association with the conversation and the email message."

Gross also fails to disclose or suggest associating an email event with a conversation, wherein the conversation comprises a thread of related email messages. The Examiner points to FIG. 3I as allegedly disclosing associating an email event with a conversation. However, the "conversation" referred to in Gross is entirely different than the "conversation" recited in the claimed invention. As disclosed at, for example, col. 7 lines 1-7 of Gross, the term

“conversation” is used to mean a “dynamic data exchange” between two applications (e.g., a mail messaging system and a DDE server application). This is entirely unrelated to a conversation comprising a thread of related email messages as recited in the claims. Therefore, at the time of the invention, the claimed invention would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art in view of Belfiore and Gross, either alone or in combination. Independent claims 25, 49, and 53 are patentable over Belfiore and Gross for at least the same reasons discussed above. The dependent claims incorporate all the limitations of their respective base claims and are also patentable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-14, 16-17, 19-25, 27-31, 33-38, 40-41, 43-51, 53-55 and 57-64 as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them. In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants’ representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
DAVID B. AUERBACH, et al.

Date: April 25, 2008

By: /Jason E. Amsel/

Jason E. Amsel, Registration No. 60,650
Patent Agent
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California St.
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7692
Fax: (650) 938-5200